



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1093/res/hgr052](https://doi.org/10.1093/res/hgr052)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Stokes, P. A. (2012). The Vision of Leofric: Manuscript, Text and Context. *REVIEW OF ENGLISH STUDIES*, 63(261), 529-550. <https://doi.org/10.1093/res/hgr052>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

This is a pre-copyedited, author-produced PDF of an article accepted for publication in Review of English Studies following peer review. The definitive publisher-authenticated version,

P.A. Stokes, The Vision of Leofric: Manuscript Text and Context, *Review of English Studies* 63 (2012): 529–50. doi:10.1093/res/hgr052
is available online at <http://res.oxfordjournals.org/content/63/261/529>

The Vision of Leofric: Manuscript, Text and Context

Abstract. This paper deals with the manuscript and historical contexts of the Old English ‘Vision of Leofric’, an account of miraculous visions seen by Earl Leofric of Mercia (d. 1057). This text has rarely been studied and never in its manuscript context. It is shown here that the only surviving manuscript of the ‘Vision’ was written at Worcester at the end of the eleventh century, copied in the context of attempts by the bishop and community at the cathedral to recover lands lost to or threatened by the secular nobility including the sons of Earl Leofric himself. Two of the other texts in the same manuscript have been re-dated, and one of the scribes identified as ‘Hemming’, the scribe who copied part of and possibly composed sections of a cartulary. The textual transmission of the ‘Vision’ is also discussed, and comparison is made to a similar account in Osbert of Clare’s *Vita Sancti Edwardi Confessoris*, particularly an account there of a *schedula* upon which the earl’s vision was said to be written. Finally a new edition and translation of the ‘Vision’ is presented.

The anonymous Old English ‘Vision of Leofric’ has received remarkably little attention from students of Anglo-Saxon literature.¹ It is a prose account structured in four episodes, each of which describes a vision seen by Leofric, earl of Mercia (d. 1057), and three of which take place in Kent: it is therefore quasi-hagiographical, portraying the earl as almost a saint.² The title is taken from an apparently mediaeval heading, reading ‘UISIO LEOFRICI’, which is now barely visible; this title is somewhat misleading given the four separate visions which the text describes. Despite the lack of attention given to this text, ‘The Vision of Leofric’ prompts questions about its purpose and the historical context of its composition during the second half of the eleventh century, a period which saw significant political upheaval in England. In particular, the ‘Vision’ itself has recently been associated with Coventry,³ and although the account may have originated there a close study of the manuscript context in which it survives shows that the only surviving copy was produced and used by the monastic community at Worcester, that early accounts of the text’s transmission are also associated with Worcester, and that both the manuscript and the transmission are connected directly to identifiable historical figures such as Hemming and Coleman who lived and worked with Saint Wulfstan, Bishop of Worcester from 1062 to 1095. However, these associations are

surprising because other records from Worcester at this time, specifically Hemming's own *enucleatio libelli*, openly accuse Leofric's descendants of despoiling the monastic community there. To address this difficulty, we must examine very closely the surviving manuscript and the texts and scribal hands it contains, also considering how that manuscript was put together, before turning to the 'Vision' itself, its transmission, form and purpose, and the implications of these for our understanding of the text, its context, and the important historical figures associated with it.

THE MANUSCRIPT

Only one copy of 'The Vision of Leofric' survives, in three leaves at the back of a complex manuscript, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS. 367, a composite book which was apparently put together by Archbishop Matthew Parker (1559–75). While CCCC 367 only has one hundred and five leaves, those leaves contain fifteen different texts drawn from seven different manuscripts which were written over some four centuries, some on paper and others on parchment. The full contents have been described in detail elsewhere, and digital facsimile of the entire manuscript with bibliography and catalogue-description is now available online; the facsimile and bibliography require a very substantial subscription-fee, but the catalogue description is available without charge.⁴ After the present article was written, the manuscript was refoliated in one continuous sequence throughout the whole volume; therefore foliations here and in all other printed works at the time of writing are fifty-three folios behind the Library's. The online catalogue description has silently followed the new foliation and also divides the book into 'volumes'.

The last eight leaves form a distinct codicological unit, and so only these need concern us here. They are now bound as a quire of eight (wanting 1, 7, and 8), followed by a bifolium and then a singleton. The leaves have all been ruled with twenty-two lines to the page, the writing-frame measuring approximately 170×110 mm, and the pages themselves about 215×140 mm after trimming; the rulings of the final leaf are extremely difficult to see but seem to match the previous leaves. The pages contain nine texts, each written by a

different scribe. The contents and structure of the leaves are summarised in the table and diagram below.

	<i>Date</i>	<i>Quire</i>	<i>Folios</i>
<i>Vita breuior</i> of St Kenelm (incomplete at beginning)	<i>Saec.</i> xi <i>ex.</i>	I	45r–48r
Additions to the <i>Vita</i> , from <i>Vita et miracula</i>	<i>Saec.</i> xii ¹	I	48r
Book-list	<i>Saec.</i> xi <i>ex.</i>	I	48v1–3
‘The Vision of Leofric’	<i>Saec.</i> xi/xii	I–II	48v4–50v15
Note on ‘vesper’	<i>Saec.</i> xii ¹	II	50v17–20
Latin neumed sequences	<i>Saec.</i> xi <i>ex.</i>	II	51r7–51v13
Letter to the prior, cantor, and monks of Worcester	<i>Saec.</i> xii ¹	III	52r1–15
Charm	<i>Saec.</i> xii ¹	III	52r16–17
Monastic constitutions (incomplete at beginning)	<i>Saec.</i> xii/xiii	III	52v

Figure 1: Quire Diagram

In order to explain the manuscript context of ‘The Vision of Leofric’, I shall now give a brief summary of the contents of these leaves.

The Vita breuior

The first of the texts comprises eight lections from the *Vita breuior* of St Kenelm of Winchester.⁵ The first lection and part of the second are missing, suggesting the loss of a single leaf at the start of the quire, and the eighth lection finishes on 48r with the remainder of the page being left blank. The blank space at the bottom of 48r was subsequently filled with a maze-design, and this in turn was written over by a twelfth-century scribe who added part of the *Vita et miracula* of St Kenelm to the end of the *Vita breuior*.⁶ The *Vita et miracula*

continues immediately from the *Vita breuior* in mid-sentence without any indication of a transition, suggesting that the former is a direct continuation of the latter. The text has been crammed into the space at the bottom of the page as well as in the outer margin, some of which has since been lost to trimming.

The script of the *Vita breuior* is Anglo-Caroline minuscule, written in black ink, and majuscules are highlighted in red. Each new lection begins with a rubric which indicates the lection-number and a larger but undecorated initial. The script has been dated to the middle or third quarter of the eleventh century and tentatively localised to Worcester.⁷ However, books written at Worcester during this period typically display a distinct, rotund minuscule, which is different from that of the leaves in question.⁸ Fortunately, we do not have to look far to find parallels for this script, nor indeed to find the scribe himself: it is the ‘Hemming’ of ‘Hemming’s Cartulary’, a monk who has been identified in several manuscripts from Worcester including a cartulary, all datable some time around the 1080s and ‘90s. The scribe was discussed by Neil Ker, who proposed that this was the very Hemming who is named in the cartulary.⁹ Ker’s identification of the scribe in several different manuscripts seems to have been based at least in part on what he saw as a characteristic mark of punctuation, a triangle of dots with a comma beneath it, and this form is indeed found in the *Vita breuior*.¹⁰ However, although the symbol is uncommon except in writing by ‘Hemming’, it is found in some other manuscripts which were certainly written by different scribes but which were not noted by Ker.¹¹ Nevertheless, the writing attributed to ‘Hemming’ shows more distinctive features than this one form of punctuation, and these features all correspond very closely with those of the *Vita breuior*. The same horned **e**, Insular **h**, and different forms of **a** are common across all these hands, as is the separated **c+t** ligature, the relatively narrow and angular **s+t** ligature, and the ‘old-fashioned’ and ‘less professional’ appearance when compared with other hands from Worcester of this period.¹² A close comparison reveals with some considerable certainty that the *Vita breuior* was also written by the ‘Hemming’ scribe. This, in turn, means that the received dating of the middle or third quarter of the eleventh century is almost certainly too early; no doubt the ‘old-fashioned’ nature of the hand misled Ker and others.

Figure 2: Examples of letters by the ‘Hemming’ scribe. Images are to scale with others from the same manuscript but not across different manuscripts. All images reproduced by permission of the Master and Fellows, Corpus Christi College Cambridge.

The Book-list

The first line of 48v is blank, but the following three lines contain a book-list written in Old English. The list has been printed and discussed by Michael Lapidge, who has attributed it to Worcester around 1050, although this date is no longer sustainable given the revised date of the *Vita breuior*.¹³ The list describes ten books with eight different sets of contents; the last of these is written in a lighter ink and on a new line, suggesting that it was a later addition though probably by the same scribe. Lapidge has identified five extant manuscripts as ‘probably’ corresponding with those on the list, all five being from Worcester.¹⁴ The list has also been attributed to the Worcester scribe Coleman who died in 1113, but, while there are similarities in the script, it is difficult to be confident about such an assertion, not least because the minuscule letter-forms which have been signed by Coleman seem to vary quite noticeably, so it is difficult to make confident attributions on the basis of script alone.¹⁵ Nevertheless, the script is not inconsistent with Coleman’s writing, particularly the use of round and horned *e* and almost exclusively tall *s*, the small bodies but long ascenders and descenders of letters, and the use of both Caroline and single-compartment *a*. In all these respects, the script seems to show post-Conquest influence, even if it lacks the pointedness generally associated with these later products, and therefore suggests a date late in the eleventh century. This accords well with that just given for the *Vita breuior*, and it also suggests that the manuscript remained at and continued to be used at Worcester during the episcopate of St Wulfstan and probably shortly after, a point that will soon become relevant.

‘The Vision of Leofric’

The book-list is followed immediately by ‘The Vision of Leofric’ itself.¹⁶ A very faint title, ‘VISIO LEOFRICI’, was added in an irregular majuscule script in the space left on 48v4. The

scribe seems to have paid scant attention to the rulings, since the last few letters of the title sit well below the baseline. The main text opens with a large **h**, and the remainder of the first line of the text is in enlarged mixed majuscules. The script is very inconsistent and poorly written, whence Ker's description of it as 'a rough ugly hand' of the second half of the eleventh century; as this discussion has demonstrated, however, the text must be later rather than earlier in this range.¹⁷ Nevertheless, when compared with the previous scripts in this manuscript, that of the 'Vision' is remarkably conservative. Although the ascenders are slightly longer, the descenders are about as long as the bodies are high; similarly, the bodies of the letters are quite rotund and are much larger relative to the vertical space between line-rulings. The proportions, then, are closer to those of the 'Hemming' hand, and indeed of earlier examples of Anglo-Caroline, than of the book-list which precedes it. To complicate matters further, the script is quite inconsistent, both in aspect and in letter-forms. Indeed, lines 48v13–21 are quite close in aspect to the typical script of Worcester in the 1060s, the letters having the large, round bodies of that style. The scribe used only round **a** and a mixture of tall and low **s** on 48v, while the following pages have only Caroline **a** and long **s**.¹⁸ Similarly, the descenders of 48v are straight, while those of the following pages curve back up to the left. However, the appearance of an unpractised, 'rough and ugly' script is consistent throughout, as are some characteristic letter-forms, particularly the sharp leftward hook at the end of the prominent ascender on **ð**. Given this commonality, it seems that the 'Vision' was probably written by a single scribe, but with the possibility of a second on 48v. This irregularity in script may suggest an unpractised scribe, although the apparent conservatism of aspect argues against this. The change in the form of **a** could possibly be because the scribe was initially influenced by the script of his exemplar. The text itself suggests that it was composed soon after Leofric's death in 1057, and so an exemplar from soon after this is entirely likely. Numerous examples of script from this period survive, and the round **a** is the normal form in these, but it was also the first of the Insular letter-forms to drop out of regular usage and had largely disappeared by the twelfth century. The scribe of the 'Vision' could perhaps have reproduced this round **a** for the first page, consciously or otherwise, but then slipped back into the Caroline form to which he was accustomed.¹⁹

Note on 'vesper'; Latin neumed sequences

The next text, which follows the 'Vision' after a blank line (50v17–20), is a short piece in Latin on the word *uesperus*. It is written in an irregular and apparently careless hand in black ink; M.R. James dated the script to the thirteenth century, to which I would only add that a date early in that century seems likely.²⁰ I have not found any part of this text elsewhere, except for a quotation of line 294 of Theodolus's *Eclogues*. The remaining two lines of 50v are blank.

The top third or so of 51r is blank, and two large holes have been cut in this space. After the holes there is a single blank line (51r6), followed by two Latin sequences, both written in a single style of script. The letter-forms are those of Anglo-Caroline minuscule from the mid-late eleventh century but are forward-leaning and relatively narrow, with sharply angled feet at the baseline, thus suggesting Norman influence.²¹ The first sequence is part of the Sarum rite for Christmas and was in common usage from the twelfth century onwards.²² The second sequence is for Epiphany and has been documented from the eleventh century.²³ The last line of the first text appears to have been added by a different scribe: the script becomes consistently smaller than previously, and round-backed **d** was used instead of the Caroline form. The entire text has neumes, written in a brown ink down to the end of the first text, then in purple for the first five lines of the second before changing back to brown for the remainder of the text. The neumes have been discussed by Susan Rankin, who has commented on the 'tremendous consistency' in the musical notation written at Worcester in the second half of the eleventh century, including that of CCCC 367.²⁴ A paragraph-mark, looking not unlike runic **f**, has been added in the left margin at 51r19 to indicate the start of the second text. A small number of corrections has also been made, apparently by the main scribe. The sequence continues onto the verso, but the top part of this page has also been left blank. Unlike on the recto, however, there is no blank line between the sequence and the holes on this side, and indeed the tips of some ascenders seem to have been cut off by the larger hole. Other than the sequence and a few pen-trials, the remainder of the verso is blank.

Letter to the prior, cantor, and monks of Worcester; Charm

The next text in the manuscript, at 52r1–15, is a letter from the abbot and prior of Westminster Abbey to the prior, cantor and brothers of Worcester Cathedral. It can be dated 1132×1138, again indicating continued use of the manuscript at Worcester into the twelfth century.²⁵ The script is carelessly written and seems to have been freshened up in places. Ker dated the script to the first half of the twelfth century, thus implying that this is a near-contemporary copy;²⁶ the date can be refined to the second quarter of that century, given the internal evidence just discussed. The letter is followed by a short text (52r16–17) in a different hand which is apparently a charm against fever. The rest of the page is blank, except for what seem to be pen-trials towards the foot of the page.

Monastic Constitutions

Finally, 52v contains the end of a set of as-yet unidentified monastic ‘constitutions’. The page is laid out in two columns, but the top of the first line and the left-hand edge of the first column have been lost to trimming. There are indications that the page was ruled with a frame matching that of folio 51 and the preceeding quire; unfortunately, the quality of the parchment is such that it is very difficult to make out these rulings. Nevertheless, the scribe of the ‘constitutions’ ignored these rulings, writing fifty-one lines per column, as compared with twenty-two in the preceding leaves; furthermore, the text extends outside where the original writing-frame would have been. A thin cut and small hole in the parchment was avoided by the scribe for the most part, suggesting that it preceded the script. The text refers to the Decrees of the Third Lateran Council, thereby establishing a *terminus post quem* of 1179.²⁷ The script is very small, compact, heavily abbreviated, and quite angular. Some elements suggest a date in the thirteenth century, but the lack of ‘biting’ curves suggest an earlier date, perhaps of the late twelfth or early thirteenth century.²⁸

Construction of the Manuscript

The texts and scripts discussed here seem to indicate very clearly that the manuscript was produced at Worcester in the late eleventh century and remained there, apparently used by members of the monastic community, for at least a century and probably more. However, this argument depends heavily on the process by which the manuscript was constructed, and so this process must now be investigated in further detail. It seems likely that ‘Hemming’ started writing on the first leaf of a new quire, finishing his text on what is now 48r. We can also speculate that the last three leaves of the quire were left blank, and presumably the last two leaves were cut out and used elsewhere. The first leaf of the quire (folio 45) would thus have become a singleton, and subsequently detached and lost. The layout of 48v suggests that the book-list was the next text to be added, followed soon after by ‘The Vision of Leofric’. It seems logical to deduce that folios 50–51 were added at this time, although it is hard to determine why a bifolium was added rather than a singleton. Perhaps the scribe intended to add further texts, but such plans were never fulfilled. Perhaps the present folios 50 and 51 originally stood as the outer leaves of a complete quire, the remainder of which was left unused, the central leaves being salvaged for other purposes. This could explain why folio 51 is in such poor condition despite it now being an internal leaf, and also why the facing folio 50 is not damaged even at the points where it now meets the holes in folio 51; indeed, if the postulated leaves between folios 50 and 51 were similarly damaged, this could explain their subsequent removal as well.

The order of events in the construction of folio 51 is also problematic. One possible explanation is that a poor-quality piece of parchment was used, which already had the holes in it before any text was added. Such a hypothesis accounts for the top portion of the folio being left blank on both sides, particularly given the single blank line which has been left between the larger hole and the beginning of the text (51r7), although it seems that parts of letters on the verso have been cut off, and one would suppose that the scribe would have avoided the holes if they were present when he was writing. These factors suggest that at least the larger hole was cut after the text was written, thereby explaining the losses on the verso but failing to account for the large amount of space left on both sides, or for the holes

being cut in the first place. The script of the sequences also provides difficulties: it seems to be the earliest of all the passages in this part of the manuscript, but this is unlikely given its position in the manuscript. It is also unlikely that the sequences were the work of an imitative or conservative scribe, since the script accords so well with pre-Conquest examples in aspect, proportions, and letter-forms. Finally, the writing-frame is identical on all eight leaves, which seems to demand that they were ruled together, although one may wonder why folio 52 was added at all. It could never have been part of the outer bifolium of the original quire, since there is no text missing from the 'Vision'. It also seems that the leaf always formed an integral part of the manuscript, even though all the texts on this folio are self-contained, since the writing-frame matches that of the previous leaves. Whatever the case, it seems clear that these leaves were used over a significant period of time, with texts being added during this period, even though the pages were damaged and even had portions removed. Furthermore, given the connexions with Worcester which I have noted in the *Vita breuior*, the book-list, the 'Vision', and the letter, in respect of both scripts and texts, the one thing which does seem extremely likely is that the received attribution of the entire section to the Cathedral is indeed correct, even if the date is later than has previously been thought.

TEXT AND CONTEXT

Now that the details of the manuscript's origin and early provenance have been established, the question arises how the text of the 'Vision' itself was transmitted and preserved in its current form. Investigating this question reveals that the text itself, as well as its surviving manuscript, has associations with Worcester in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

Transmission

One intriguing reference to the 'Vision', and particularly to its composition and transmission, survives in an account written by a twelfth-century hagiographer, Osbert of Clare, who included a vision of Leofric in his *Vita S. Edwardi*.²⁹ Osbert's account is most like the last of the visions given in the Old English text, but with a number of important differences. In both

texts, Leofric and the king are at a service together in the southeast of England when a figure appears and gives a blessing; Leofric is unable to behold the divine vision and ultimately looks down. The king then orders the earl not to reveal what has happened to anyone ‘quamdiu ambo spiritum huius corporis agimus’.³⁰ Despite these similarities, however, there are important differences. The author of the ‘Vision’ placed the events at Sandwich, whereas Osbert located them at Westminster. The king plays no active role in the ‘Vision’, but Osbert had the king reassure Leofric and tell him to stay still. While the text in CCC 367 provides a detailed description of the vision and the setting in which it appears, Osbert’s account is much less specific; however, the later author is quite explicit that it was Christ who had appeared, whereas in the earlier version the vision consists only of a hand, the owner of which remains unspecified. These differences in the texts, while significant, are explicable. It seems plausible that many of the details would have been lost during the transmission from eleventh-century Worcester to twelfth-century Westminster, even without any active interference on Osbert’s part.³¹ Furthermore, Osbert would have been keen to emphasise the king’s role in the events, making him the recipient of the blessing and the bestower of wisdom, thereby increasing his sanctity. The change from Sandwich to Westminster can perhaps be explained by Osbert’s interests once again, since he would have wished to emphasise the role of his own house as well as its association with the king. Even after these changes, however, enough similarities between the two texts remain to indicate that Osbert’s account is related to the fourth episode in the ‘Vision’, rather than being entirely independent.

Of greater interest to the current discussion, however, is Osbert’s account of the text’s transmission. Osbert wrote that Leofric returned to Worcester after having his vision; that the earl related what he saw to a Worcester monk, who wrote it down on a *schedula*; that the account was kept secret and placed with the cathedral’s relics, presumably because of the king’s order not to reveal the story until after both of their deaths. It lay hidden for many years, until, after Edward had died and when Wulfstan II was bishop, the *urna* containing it, consumed by age, opened itself. The text was found and read before all in the church of Worcester (*coram cunctis in ecclesia legitur*), where it was seen (*oculis suis uidit*) by Maurice who was then subdeacon of Worcester and later a monk of Westminster. Maurice

therefore brought the account to Westminster, where Osbert later incorporated it into his *Vita S. Edwardi*. Certainly the miraculous rediscovery of the text must give us pause, and, as Jackson has pointed out, many aspects of this account are commonplaces from hagiography and vision literature.³² Nevertheless, it agrees remarkably well with other evidence at a number of points. The subdeacon Maurice is known from elsewhere, and his career, as far as we can reconstruct it, accords with Osbert's account.³³ Osbert himself is known to have connexions with the west country.³⁴ More significantly, as I have argued above, our surviving copy of the 'Vision' was written in the late eleventh or early twelfth century, and so quite possibly during the bishopric of Wulfstan II (1062–95) and when 'Hemming' was compiling the Worcester Cartulary and presumably also copying the *Vita breuior* of St Kenelm.³⁵ Indeed, these agreements tempt one to suggest that the leaves which now form part of CCCC 367 were written at the command of that bishop, after precisely such a discovery by the ecclesiastical community at Worcester.³⁶ I know of no other accounts which involve hiding manuscript leaves in this way, but both Bloch and Barlow have discussed schedules as one interpretation of Osbert's account. Bloch argued that Osbert's *Vita* and the corresponding material in William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum Anglorum* drew independently upon *schedulae* which Osbert mentioned as sources for his account.³⁷ Barlow has rightly asked what these *schedulae* were and concluded that 'among Osbert's sources were schedules of miracles such as were commonly kept by the guardians of shrines'.³⁸ Although neither author is clear on what is meant by a 'schedule', Barlow has supported his conclusion with three examples of references to such *schedulae*: one from Goscelin of St Bertin, one from Osbern of Christ Church, Canterbury, and one from Osbert himself referring to the document in which Leofric's vision was first written.³⁹ However, it is not at all clear that the three authors were referring to the same type of document. Neither Osbern nor Goscelin used the word *schedula* in his account, but referred instead to *libri* and thus implied gatherings, if not complete codices.⁴⁰ The term *schedula*, however, seems to refer to a single sheet and was used most commonly in a documentary context.⁴¹ Ælfric Bata distinguished between *schedula*, *cartula*, *pergamento*, and *dyptica* in his Colloquies, although D.W. Porter has argued that any of these Latin words 'could be considered a *liber*, the generic equivalent of

boc'.⁴² Porter has also noted that the words *scheda* and *schedula* seem to be interchangeable, and has translated them both as 'parchment scraps or rolls or pages', but has also acknowledged their interpretation in Ælfric's Glossary as *ymele*, 'scroll'.⁴³ In every case, however, the sense is of a single sheet rather than a codex, and indeed Osbert himself also referred to the item found in the *scrinium* as *pagina*. Such terminology suggests that Osbert may have been discussing something different from that of Osbern or Goscelin.

A further possibility is raised by Osbert's use of the term *scrinium* to describe the place where the *schedula* was stored. Though initially referring simply to a place for storing books or papers, the word took on additional meanings during the Middle Ages, including 'reliquary' and perhaps 'ecclesiastical archive'.⁴⁴ These last two meanings suggest Old English *haligdom*, which could mean 'relics' or 'reliquary' but was also used in the context of storing documents, thus suggesting that relics and documents may have been routinely kept in the same place.⁴⁵ The notion of 'archive' is especially intriguing since Hemming used precisely the same term to refer to the place where the ecclesiastical community of Worcester stored its records during the time of Wulfstan II, even stating that '*scrinium monasterii coram se reserari fecit*'.⁴⁶ This passage has been taken to mean that Bishop Wulfstan had the archive opened in front of him during his programme for restoring the episcopal records; such an interpretation is entirely reasonable and probably what Hemming intended.⁴⁷ However, if one takes *scrinium* as the subject, and *coram* as an adverb rather than a preposition, then the passage reads 'the monastery's archive had itself opened publicly', which agrees very closely with Osbert's account, and such a misreading may even have been the source for this version of the story. Although I should require much stronger evidence before suggesting that the monk of Westminster had seen Hemming's Cartulary, this reference does provide an interesting corroboration of Osbert's version of the text's transmission. Indeed, it is entirely possible that an account of Leofric's Vision had been written down and then stored with the community's documents; it had then been forgotten through precisely the process which the bishop was trying to rectify;⁴⁸ as part of the same programme which produced Hemming's Cartulary, the record of the Vision was found and copied on the leaves which now form part of CCCC 367. Such a reading is complicated by Osbert's later use of the word *urna* to refer

to the container in which the account was stored: this term was normally used for a funerary urn in which relics were kept, and it is hard to imagine that documents were routinely kept sealed in such vessels.⁴⁹ This could be dismissed as another embellishment or misunderstanding of Osbert's: the account of a single sheet kept with the ecclesiastical documents could easily have transformed into one of a vision-text being sealed up in a funerary urn and hidden with the other relics until revealing itself to the community when the appropriate time had come.

Form and Purpose

Now that we have addressed the circumstances in which our copy of the text was made, those of its composition need to be considered. Leofric is portrayed as an exceptionally pious man privileged with a sequence of visions as well as foreknowledge of his own death. The text stops short of being truly hagiographical — Leofric is never explicitly described as saintly, and he is a passive recipient of miracles rather than a grantor of miracles for others — but it contains elements of Saints' Lives nonetheless. Indeed, there are some interesting parallels between the portrayal of Leofric in the 'Vision' and that of St Wulfstan in his *Vita*: both men were said to have frequented churches secretly at night, and both had visions which included bright lights and loud noises on such occasions.⁵⁰ While I do not wish to push such parallels too far, it does seem at least possible that 'The Vision of Leofric' was written as part of a drive for the earl's canonisation.⁵¹ It has also been suggested that the monks of Worcester at the end of the eleventh century had an active interest in the hagiography of local saints,⁵² and this interest could have been extended to other holy figures of note. However, accounts of Leofric written at Worcester were by no means universal in their praise. Most historical sources do emphasise the earl's holiness and particularly his benefactions to Coventry Abbey.⁵³ The notable exception is Hemming, who made repeated reference in his Cartulary to the household of Leofwine and its perceived despoliation of Worcester.⁵⁴ Furthermore, although Godgifu is included in the obituary lists of Worcester Cathedral, Leofric is not.⁵⁵ As some historians have noted, however, even Hemming's account is not entirely negative, and

Leofric and Godgifu's benefactions to the cathedral are mentioned in a short hagiography of St Wulfstan which occurs later in the same cartulary.⁵⁶ Finally, Osbert's story that Leofric went directly from the court to Worcester suggests that the earl maintained a close relationship with the cathedral, although this detail may have been an inference of the author rather than historical fact. Nonetheless, both the form of the 'Vision' and its historical circumstances argue against the author having had any intention to write a hagiographical account.

Another possibility is suggested by the opening words of the 'Vison'. As described above, the first line is written in enlarged mixed majuscules and reads 'Her gesutelað ða gesihðe ðe Leofric eorl gesæh'.⁵⁷ Once we allow for spelling variants, this formula — *her swutelað*, *her geswutelað*, or *her ys geswutelod* — occurs frequently in the corpus of Old English, but almost exclusively at the opening of vernacular writs. A search of the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus* returns eighty-three occurrences of the phrase, of which all but six are in documentary or legal contexts.⁵⁸ One of these exceptions is a brief vernacular history of Bishop Wulfstan II, which survives in Hemming's Cartulary, in the midst of a series of charters relating to the bishop's attempts to regain land allegedly taken from the Cathedral.⁵⁹ Even this example, then, is within a documentary context of sorts, and its presence at Worcester during the late eleventh century raises the possibility that the one may have been influenced by, or even have had the same author as, the other. Whether or not this is the case, the opening words of the 'Vision', the writing of the text on a *schedula*, and the storing of the *schedula* in a *scrinium*, all combine to suggest that the 'Vision' may have been conceived of as a documentary rather than literary or purely historical record.

If the form of the 'Vision' is not fully hagiographical and is at least partially documentary, then the question of its purpose remains. One possibility is simply that the ecclesiastical community of Worcester wished to collect accounts of miracles in and relating to their house. Certainly the inclusion of Saints' Lives would be consistent with such a purpose, and the addition of historical records and book-lists is paralleled by similar additions to altar-books.⁶⁰ However, Kenelm was not local to Worcester, and indeed Leofric's visions all took place in Kent; therefore neither Kenelm's *Vita breuior* nor Leofric's 'Vision' is

entirely appropriate in a local compilation concerning Worcester.⁶¹ Furthermore, the documentary nature of the 'Vision' is at odds with such an interpretation, and the poor quality of the parchment and relatively low grade of script suggest that our manuscript did not hold a position of any great importance at the cathedral. Perhaps the leaves in CCCC 367 were written to be copied into another, higher-grade, manuscript, perhaps a liturgical book given the strong liturgical element that has been observed in the texts.⁶² Without further information, however, it is difficult to draw any firm conclusions.

If the internal evidence cannot provide a conclusive purpose for the text, then we must look to the historical context of both Leofric and his visions. Milton Gatch has done some work on this subject, but focusing on the ecclesiastical context rather than the secular.⁶³ However, another aspect of the text's purpose is suggested by the fortunes of Leofric's family.⁶⁴ By the mid-1060s, Leofric's grandsons Edwin and Morcar were earls of Mercia and Northumbria respectively.⁶⁵ Although the historical sources conflict in their reports, it seems that the two brothers came into conflict with King William I in 1068.⁶⁶ They submitted quickly and were not directly involved in the uprising of 1069, but, as Ann Williams has noted, they must both have been affected by the conflict in Mercia and the harrying of the North; furthermore, it is certain that they lost a good deal of land at the hands of the new king.⁶⁷ They both fled their respective homes, after which Edwin was killed by his own men while Morcar went to Ely and played a central role in the rebellion there. Morcar was captured by the Conqueror in 1071 and held in Normandy until being released by the dying king, but he was immediately seized again by William Rufus; he died while still in captivity.⁶⁸ In such a context, the extended family must have suffered greatly under the Normans and would have been concerned to achieve whatever favour they could with the king. One way of doing this, then, would be to emphasise the virtue of previous generations of their family. By portraying Leofric as an exceptionally pious man having close connexions with King Edward, the Mercian earls may have hoped to appease the king's wrath. William Rufus's re-imprisonment of Morcar demonstrated the Normans' animosity towards the earl some fifteen years after the uprising, and thus the danger which the family must have faced well into the 1080s and potentially beyond. Indeed, such a concern may even have lain

behind Hemming's criticism of the two brothers: while he described Leofric and Godgifu in ambiguous terms, his portrayal of Edwin and Morcar was nothing short of scathing, accusing them of being driven by the devil and describing their unfortunate ends at some length.⁶⁹

One question which this hypothesis raises is why the 'Vision' is focused entirely on Kent, particularly given both the earl's and the manuscript's origins in Worcester. Indeed, the focus is perhaps even narrower than this, since Sandwich was itself probably controlled by the community of Christ Church.⁷⁰ Such emphasis was perhaps intended to legitimise the visions: since they occurred in and around the seat of ecclesiastical power in England, it would be much more difficult to challenge their authenticity. Alternatively, if the 'Vision' was written to appease the Normans, then it may be significant that much of William's power was in the Southeast. Furthermore, Sandwich was important during the Godwinist uprising of 1052, in which Leofric actively supported the king.⁷¹ Although we do not know that the earl himself was with the fleet at that time, the author of the 'Vision' may be reminding his readers of these events, perhaps even hinting that this was Leofric's 'duty'. By omitting any mention of Mercia, and stressing instead a presence in Kent, the author of the 'Vision' may have been seeking further to emphasise the earl's connexion with the seat of mainstream-power, rather than with the politically sensitive west.

EDITION AND TRANSLATION

The text of 'The Vision of Leofric' has been entirely re-edited and retranslated below. Abbreviations have been expanded, except for the *siglum* ȝ, and such expansions are indicated by the use of *italic type*. Editorial insertions have been indicated by angle-brackets <>. Insertions made in the manuscript have been indicated by caret-marks: ` ´.

Visio Leofrici

[48v] HER GESUTELAD DA GESIHDE DE LEOFRIC EORL

GESÆH. Him puhte to soðan on healfslapendon lichaman na callinga swyƿce on sweƿne ac gyt gewisslicor þæt he sceolde nede ofer ane swiðe smale brige. 7 seo was swiƿe lang 7 þær arn swiðe feor beneoðan egeslic water swyƿce hit ea wære. Ða þa he mid þam gedraht was þa cwæð him stefn to. ‘Ne forhta þu, eaðe þu þa brige oferferest.’ Mid þam þa wearð he sona ofere nyste he hu. Ða þa he ofere was, þa com him lateow ongean 7 hƿne lædde to anum swyðe wlitigan felde 7 swyƿe fægern mid swetan stence aƿlled. Ða geseah hē swyƿe mycele weorud swyƿce on gangdagan. 7 þa wæron ealle mid snawhwítum réafe gescredde, 7 þæt on þa wisan þe se diacon bið þonne he godspell ret, 7 wæs an þæra on middan standende on massepceostes réafe swyƿe heah. 7 swyðe mycel ofer eal þæt oper folc. Ða cwæð se latteow, ‘Wast þu hwæt þis seo?’ ‘Nese,’ cwæð he. ‘Hit is *Sanctus* Paulus hæfeð nu gemæssod 7 bletsað nu þis folc.’ Ða lædde he hine furðor þæt hi [49r] coman þær þær sæton six arwurðlice menn swiðe wurðlice gefretewod.

The Vision of Leofric

HERE IS MADE KNOWN THE VISIONS WHICH EARL

LEOFRIC SAW. It seemed to him truly when he was half asleep, not entirely like in a dream but more certainly, that he had to cross a very long and narrow bridge, with terrifying water like a river very far beneath it. When he was concerned with this, a voice said to him, ‘Do not be afraid, you will cross the bridge easily.’ Then with that he was immediately across; he did not know how. When he was across, a guide came to him and led him to a very beautiful and very fair field filled with a very sweet smell. Then he saw a very large throng like on Rogation Day who were all clothed in snow-white garments, just as the deacon is when he reads the gospel. One of them was in the middle in mass-priest’s clothing, standing very high up and well above the other people. Then the guide said, ‘Do you know what this is?’ ‘No,’ he said. ‘It is St Paul who has now celebrated mass and blesses these people.’ Then he led him further until they came where six venerable men sat, very splendidly clothed. One of the men said, ‘Why must this

Visio Leofrici

Da cwæð heora an, 'Hwæt sceoll þæs fula mann on ure færræddene?' Þa andswarode him oper 7 cwæð, 'He mot beon mid us, he is niwan gefullod þurh dædbote, 7 he cymð to us on þære þriddan gebyrde'.

Da wæs eac his gewuna þæt he wolde swyþe lytel drincan, þeah he mid geþeorum bliðe wære; 7 þænne he wiste þæt menn fæste slæpen, he wolde on dihlum stowum hine georne gebiddan. Da wæs he æt Cristes cyrcan mid þam cýninge, þa spræc he on æfen wið þone cyrcward 7 hine georne bæd þæt he hine inn lete þænne he þa dura cnylde, ac he þæt forgyrde for <h>is dru<n>cennysse. Da þa he to þære dura com 7 þær langsumlice swyðe cnucede 7 georne cunnode. hwæðer he hi on ænige wisan undon mihte, ne mihte ná. Da he þære cyrcward gebyrde ofer eall hrutan þa ne wænde he him nanes incýmes. Ac feng þa on his gebedo, swa his gewuna wæs, for þær wæs an forhus æt þære cyrcan duru. Da on þa gebede wearð seo duru fæxin 'c'ga geopenad, 7 he þa sona in eode 7 hine to his Drihtene gebæd up ahafenum earmum. Da warð his leohtbora afyrht swyþe 7 gefeall him in anan heale 7 mid þære forthnæsse þæt hine ofereode slæp.

The Vision of Leofric

foul man be in our fellowship?' Then another answered him, saying 'He can be with us, he is newly baptized through penitence, and he will come to us on his third [re]birth [into Paradise]'.⁸⁴

It was also his custom then to drink very little, although he would be happy with drinking-companions, and when he knew that men were fast asleep he would eagerly pray in secret. When he was at Christ's Church (Canterbury) with the king, he spoke with the sacristan one evening and eagerly asked him to let him in when he knocked on the doors, but the sacristan failed this because of his [the sacristan's] drunkenness. Then Leofric came to the doors and knocked there a lot for a long time, trying eagerly to open them somehow, but he could not. When he heard the churchwarden snore above everything else, then he had no hope of entering. However, he began his prayers as was his practice, for there was a porch at the church door. Then during his prayers the door suddenly opened, and he immediately went in, and he prayed to his Lord with his arms raised up. Then his light-bearer became very afraid and fell into a corner and was numb, overcome with terror. Then Leofric saw very clearly that he

20 Stokes

Da geseah he full gewisslice þæt he stod on middan þære' flore
apenedum earmum mid mæsse [49v] gescrydd 7 hæfde grene
mæsselacelan on him beorhte scinende, 7 he þæs swyðe wundrode.

Eft hit getimode æt oðrum sæle þæt he was mid þam kynge at
þære ylcan stowe. Da dyde he swa his gewuna wæs: eode to cyrcean mid
his preom cnápan þa þa oðre mén slepon, 7 he hine þa gebæd eal swa
his gewuna wæs; þæt was swa neh *Sancte* Dunstanes byrgenne swa he
nest mihte. Da wurðen þa twege cnápan sona on slæpe, 7 se bridda
wacode þæt swiðor for ége þonne for his gebedum. Da gehyrde he
færinga swyðe ungerýdelic gelyd þam gelicost þe he árost swylce þara
muneca setl ferlice feollon ealle togedere 7 was æfre swa lengre swa
hluddre 7 meniġfealdre 7 ungerýddre. Da after langum fyrste geswác
þæt gehlyd. Þær was innan þære cyrcean byrnende blacern, þa scean þær
færinga leoht inn at þam eást ende, swylce niwe mona arise, swa þæt hit
lihte under þære rode swyðoran earme þe stod ofer þæt weofed. Þa wæs
hit swa leng swa leohtre; swa lange hit leohtode þæt þæs blacernes leoht
næs nán þing gesyne, 7 þæt swa þæt hit lihte geond ealle þa wíðgyllan

himself stood in the middle of the floor, clothed with mass-[robes],
with his arms stretched out, and he wore a green chasuble which was
shining brightly, and he wondered very much at that.

After that he happened to be with the king at the same place
another time. Then he did as was his custom: he went to church with
his three servants when other men slept, and he prayed then as was his
custom as near St Dunstan's tomb as he could. Two servants
immediately fell asleep, and the third stayed awake more because of fear
than prayer. Then he suddenly heard a very violent noise, most like, at
first, as if the monks' stalls suddenly collapsed together, and the longer
it lasted the louder and more varied and violent it became. Then after a
long time the noise ceased. There was a lamp burning in the church,
when suddenly a light shone in at the east end, as if a the moon had
newly risen, so that it lit under the right arm of the cross which stood
over the altar. Then the longer it lasted the brighter it shone, so that
it shone throughout the whole wide church and the lantern's light
could not be seen. It was like that for so long that he did not dare look
at it any longer; then it waned in the same way that it had waxed

Visio Leofrici

cyrcean. Swa lange hit wæs þa on ðam þæt he hit ne dorste na lengc [sic] behaldan; 7 hit asanode þa on þa ylcan wysan þe hit ær wæxende wæs, swa ðæt he gesêh eft þæt blacern [f. 50r] leoht. 7 þæt oðer geswác, 7 se ofdrædda cnapa þæt eal mid him geseah 7 hyrde, swylce hit to gewinessę wære. 7 þa oðre slepon 7 þæs nán þing nyston.

Neh þon ylcan sæle se cing leg æt Sandwic mid scipum. Ða wæs his gewuna þæt he wolde ælce dæge habban twa massan butan hit ma wære, 7 ealle his tida togædere ær he út eode. Ða eode he ymbe sume neode þa massede man þam cynge æt *Sancte Clementes* cyrcean. Ða cwæð he to his geferan þæt hit betere wære þæt hig þa massan hæfdon. 7 he þa inn eode 7 him man sona hrymde. 7 he þa sona eode binnan þonne weohstal on norðhealf, 7 se cing stod on suðhealf. Ða wæs þær án prilig wahraegl 7 swyðe picce gewefen, þæt hangode beftan þam weofode. 7 stod þær án medmycel ród on ðære eorðan on ðam norðeasthryman. 7 wæs swa mycel þæs treowes gesyne swa wolde beon god hande brad beneopan þam wahrife, 7 se oðer dæl wæs betwux þam wahrife 7 þam wahe. 7 se preost massode be cruce. Ða geseah he ofer þa rode ane hand swylce heo bletsode. Ða wende he ærost þæt sum man

The Vision of Leofric

earlier, so that he saw the lantern's light again, and the other light ceased. The fearful servant who was with him saw and heard all of that, so that he had borne witness of it, and the others slept and knew nothing of it.

Around the same time, the king was at Sandwich with the fleet. Then it was Leofric's custom that he would have two masses each day, if not more, and all his services one after the other before he went out. Because of some duty he went to St Clement's church when mass was being celebrated for the king, and he said to his servants that it was better that they attend mass. When he went in someone called him immediately, and he went immediately into the sanctuary on the north side, and the king stood on the south side. Hanging behind the altar at that time was a triple-threaded tapestry which was woven very thickly, and a fairly small cross stood there on the ground in the north-east corner. A good hand's width of the cross was visible beneath the tapestry and the rest was between the tapestry and the wall. And the priest celebrated mass at the [altar] cross. Then Leofric saw a hand over the [small] cross as if it was blessing. At first he thought that

¹ The text was first edited and translated by A.S. Napier, 'An Old English vision of Leofric, Earl of Mercia', *Transactions of the Philological Society* (1910) 180–88. For extended discussions of the text see M.M. Gatch, 'Piety and liturgy in the Old English *Vision of Leofric*', in M. Korhammer, K. Reichl, & H. Sauer (ed.), *Words, Texts and Manuscripts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Helmut Gneuss on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Cambridge, 1992), 159–79; M.M. Gatch, 'Miracles in Architectural Settings: Christ Church, Canterbury, and St Clement's, Sandwich in the Old English *Vision of Leofric*', *Anglo-Saxon England* 22 (1993), 227–52; P. Pulsiano, 'Hortatory Purpose in the OE *Visio Leofrici*', *Medium Ævum* 54 (1985), 109–16; T.H. Silverstein, 'The *Vision of Leofric* and Gregory's *Dialogues*', *RES* 34 (1933), 186–88; G.H. Gerould, *Saints' Legends* (Boston MA 1916), 126; P. Jackson, 'Osbert of Clare and the *Vision of Leofric*: The Transformation of an Old English Narrative', in K. O'Brien O'Keefe & Andy Orchard (ed.), *Latin Learning and English Lore: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature for Michael Lapidge*, vol. 2 (Toronto 2005), 275–292 and Stephen Baxter, *The Earls of Mercia: Lordship and Power in Late Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 2007), *passim*.

² For discussion of Leofric's life and career see now Baxter, *Earls of Mercia*, and F.E. Harmer (ed. & tr.), *Anglo-Saxon writs*, 2nd edn (Stamford, 1989), 565–66.

³ Baxter, *Earls*, 154(–55) n. 6 and below, note 47.

⁴ *Parker Library on the Web*, <<http://parkerweb.stanford.edu/>>, 'Browse – Manuscript Number – 367'. M.R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1909–12), 199–204 (no. 367); E.M. Treharne, 'Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 367', in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile*, vol. 11: *Corpus Christi College Cambridge I* (Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies), 67–73.

⁵ *Three Eleventh-Century Anglo-Latin Saints' Lives: Vita S. Birini, Vita et miracula S. Kenelmi, and Vita S. Rumwoldi*, ed. and tr. R. C. Love (Oxford, 1996), especially cxxi–cxxii and 126; see also BHL *Novum Supplemenum* (Brussels, 1986), no. 4641m.

⁶ James, *Descriptive Catalogue*, ii 202. The *Vita et miracula* has been listed in BHL, no. 4642.

⁷ Ker, *Catalogue*, 110 (no. 64), for *saec. xi med.*; *Lives* cxxi, citing McIntyre, 'Worcester', 202, for *saec. xi*^{3/4}.

⁸ See Ker, *Catalogue*, lvii–viii, 398–99 (no. 331), 417 (no. 338), and plate IV, as well as N.R. Ker (ed.), *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books*, 2nd edn (London 1964) xxi, for his characterisation of the ‘typical’ hand from later eleventh-century Worcester; this has been developed more recently by R. Gameson, ‘Book Production and Decoration at Worcester in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries’, in N. Brooks & C. Cubitt (ed.), *St Oswald of Worcester: Life and Influence* (London, 1996), 194–243.

⁹ N.R. Ker, *Books, Collectors and Libraries: Studies in the Medieval Heritage*, A.G. Watson (ed) (London, 1985), 41. Ker identified this scribe as that of London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A.xiii, fols. 119–25, all of Cambridge, University Library, Kk.3.18 and London, British Library, Harley Ch. 83.A.3, and additions to Cott. Tib. A.xiii, CCCC 146, CCCC 391, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 114 (S.C. 5134), and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121 (S.C. 5232). For the identification with Hemming, see Ker, *Books*, 56; Ker, *Catalogue*, xxv, lvi, and 417; P.H. Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography* (London, 1968), 400 (no. 1421). Sawyer’s *List* is hereafter referred to as ‘S’.

¹⁰ Ker, *Books*, 41 and 43.

¹¹ Two examples in manuscripts not otherwise associated with Hemming are CCCC 198, 298v10 (reproduced by Budny, *Catalogue*, vol. 2, 481); and Salisbury, Cathedral Library, MS. 6, 198r2 and 9. I also question Ker’s attribution of Harley Ch. 83.A.3 to ‘Hemming’, since there is little in common between this hand and that of the other examples by ‘Hemming’ except for this mark of punctuation.

¹² The phrase is from Ker, *Books*, 41. For a comparison of letter-forms, see my Figure 2 or *Parker on the Web*.

¹³ M. Lapidge, ‘Surviving Booklists from Anglo-Saxon England’, in M.P. Richards (ed), *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: Basic Readings* (New York, 1994) 87–167. Lapidge presumably followed the dating to *saec. xi med.* given by Ker, *Catalogue*, 110 (no. 64).

¹⁴ Lapidge, ‘Surviving Booklists’, 131–32. The manuscripts in question are London, British Library, Cotton Otho C.i, vol. 2; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20 (S.C. 4113); Hatton 76 (S.C. 4125); CCCC 12; and CCCC 178, pp. 287–457.

¹⁵ See Budny, *Catalogue*, i xlii, for this view, which is essentially repeated on pages 189 and 548 of the same volume. For a full discussion of Coleman, see Ker, *Books*, 27–29, with additional notes identified by J. Hill, ‘Ælfric’s “Silent Days”’, *Leeds studies Studies in English*, new series, 16 (1985), 118–31, and W.P. Stoneman, ‘Another Old English note Note signed Signed “Coleman”’, *Medium Ævum* 56 (1987), 78–82.

¹⁶ Although it is presumably coincidental, we may note that the final entry in the booklist, ‘barontus’, seems to refer to another vision-narrative: *Visio S. Baronti monachi* (BHL, no. 997); see James, *Descriptive Catalogue*, vol. 2, 202, for this identification, and ‘Visio S. Baronti’, AASS, Maii iv 570–74 for the text of the *Visio*.

¹⁷ Ker, *Catalogue*, 110. Treharne has suggested 1080×1100 and 1060×1080 (‘Cambridge, CCCCC 367’, 67 and 69 respectively), but her reasons for neither date are clear to this writer.

¹⁸ I follow the definition of long s given by Ker, *Catalogue*, xxx.

¹⁹ See Ker, *Catalogue*, xxvi and xxviii, for round and Caroline a. Examples of scribes maintaining a high standard for the first few pages and then slipping are many; one is the main scribe of Cambridge, University Library, Ff.1.23 (1156), who carefully distinguished OE and Latin on fols. 5v and 6r but then quickly slipped into Insular letter-forms for both languages (see Ker, *Catalogue*, 12, no. 13).

²⁰ James, *Descriptive Catalogue*, ii 203.

²¹ See Ker, *English Manuscripts*, 23, for discussion of these features.

²² J.W. Legg (ed), *The Sarum Missal* (Oxford, 1916), 481; the sequence has been printed in AH, no. 54.2.

²³ P.L.P. Guéranger, *The Liturgical Year*, tr. L. Shepherd, vol. 2 (London, 1983), 220–21, wrote of this sequence that ‘we have seen it [the ‘Gaudete uos’] in a manuscript of the eleventh century’; unfortunately, he failed to specify the manuscript in question. The text has been printed in AH, no. 54.3.

²⁴ S. Rankin, ‘Some Reflections on Liturgical Music at Late Anglo-Saxon Worcester’, in N. Brooks & C. Cubitt (ed), *St Oswald of Worcester: Life and Influence* (London, 1996), 325–48 at 338–43, referring to CCCC 146, CCCC 198, 377v, CCCC 367, 51rv, CCCC 391, Cotton Nero E.i, vol. ii 135v–55v, and London, British Library, Royal 5.A.xii, iii–iv.

²⁵ See D. Knowles, C.N.L. Brooke, & V.C.M. London (ed), *The Heads of Religious Houses, England and Wales*, vol. 1: 940–1216, 2nd edn (Cambridge, 2001) 77 and 83 for Hubert and Warinus respectively.

²⁶ Ker, *Catalogue*, 110 (no. 64). The letter has only partially been printed, by James, *Descriptive Catalogue*, vol. 2, 203.

²⁷ The relevant chapter has been printed in *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. and tr. N.P. Tanner, vol. 1 (Washington DC, 1990), 217.

²⁸ For a discussion of letter-forms at this date, see Ker, *English Manuscripts*, 38–39, and N.R. Ker, ‘Introduction’, in J.R.R. Tolkien (ed.), *The English Text of the Ancrene Riwe: Ancrene Wisse*, EETS os 249 (London, 1962) xi–xv.

²⁹ The text of Osbert’s *Vita* was printed by M. Bloch, ‘La Vie de S. Édouard Le Confesseur par Osbert de Clare’, *Analecta Bollandiana* 41 (1923), 1–131, listed in BHL, no. 8756, and has been discussed in *The Life of King Edward who Rests at Westminster, Attributed to a Monk of Saint-Bertin*, ed. and tr. F. Barlow, 2nd edn (London, 1992), xxxiii–xxxvi, and 154, and more briefly by F. Barlow, *Edward the Confessor*, new edn (New Haven CT, 1997) 273–74. The *Vita* is contained in London, British Library, MS. Add. 36737 and the relevant chapter has recently been reprinted and translated by Jackson, ‘Osbert of Clare’, 277–278.

³⁰ ‘As long as we both breathe the breath of this body’: Bloch, ‘La Vie’, 92. The translation is my own.

³¹ Osbert’s role in the forgery of Westminster charters has been discussed most recently by J. Crick, ‘St Albans, Westminster, and some Twelfth-Century Views of the Anglo-Saxon Past’, *Anglo-Norman Studies* 25 (2002), 65–84.

³² Jackson, ‘Osbert of Clare’, 283–284.

³³ Maurice has been identified three times in the historical record. Osbert says that he became a monk of Westminster after being subdeacon of Worcester under St Wulfstan (see Ch. 12 of his *Vita*, printed and translated by Jackson, ‘Osbert of Clare’, 277–278). He has been identified in two charters, the Durham *Liber Vitae*, and perhaps a mortuary roll. See Jackson, ‘Osbert of Clare’, 279 and 288 notes 19–22.

³⁴ Jackson, ‘Osbert of Clare’, 279.

³⁵ See p. \$\$\$ above.

³⁶ For the alternative suggestion that the ‘Vision’ was composed at Coventry see Baxter, *Earls*, 154(–55) n. 6. Baxter has translated the last phrase of the text, ‘sceolde cuman to Cofantreo’ as ‘should come to Coventry’ and argued that this use of ‘come’ implies that the writer was himself at Coventry. However, the use of *cuman to* to mean ‘arrive at’ is well attested, including specifically ‘arriving at’ one’s final destination, death. See *Dictionary of Old English in Electronic Form* s.v. *cuman*, sense E.22 (*cuman to*, ‘come to, arrive at’), citing Ælfric, *Catholic Homilies* I, 12: ‘he com to deaðe’. Similar also are the 284 occurrences of *cuman* in boundary clauses in the *Langscape* database, all of which seem best translated as ‘arrive at’ and none of which presumably mean ‘come’ in the sense of movement towards the person writing. See *LangScape: The Language of Landscape: Reading the Anglo-Saxon Countryside*. <<http://langscape.org.uk>>, version 0.9, accessed 2 November, 2009, ‘Database – Explore Texts – Browse Headwords – General Glossary – *cuman*’.

³⁷ Bloch, ‘La Vie’, 45, discussed in *Vita Ædwardi*, xxxiii n. 77. According to Osbert, ‘ex diuersis namque hoc opus fratrum imperio collectum est scedulis, quas sancti patres nostri nobis reliquerunt scriptas’ (Bloch, ‘La Vie’, 66).

³⁸ *Vita Ædwardi*, xxxv.

³⁹ *Vita Ædwardi*, xxxv–xxxvi, n. 94.

⁴⁰ ‘Et quaedam quidem de libris miraculorum eius, qui nunc minime supersunt, exerpimus’, Osbern, *Vita S. Dunstani*, AASS Maii iv 359–84: 376; ‘hec in presencia memorate abbatisse Brihtigie declarata et patriis literis mandata’, A. Wilmart, ‘La légende de Ste Édith en prose et vers par le moine Goscelin’, *Analecta Bolandiana* 56 (1938), 5–101 and 265–307: 292.

⁴¹ Niermeyer defined *cedula*, or *schedula*, as ‘leaflet, slip, page’, ‘codex’, or ‘charter’: J.F. Niermeyer (ed.), *Mediae Latinitatis lexicon minus* (Leiden, 1976), 945, s.v. *schedula*. However, I am aware of no Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-Norman examples which refer to anything other than a single sheet; see R.E. Latham (ed.), *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List from British and Irish Sources* (London, 1965), 423, s.v. *scheda*, -ula, ‘schedule, document (esp. one attached to roll)’, and, for ca 1190, ‘literary trifle’. Compare also C. Du Cange (ed.), *Glossarium Mediae Et Infimae Latinitatis*, New Edition with Supplements by D.P. Carpentier, G.A.L. Henschel, and L. Favre, vol. 7 (Niort 1883–87), 347, s.v.

schedula, and, for a related example, D.N. Dumville, 'The Tribal Hidage: An Introduction to its Texts and their History', in S. Bassett (ed), *The Origins of Anglo-Saxon Kingdoms* (London, 1989), 225–30 at 230. I have also counted 125 Anglo-Saxon charters in which the term was used, most commonly in the dating-clause or witness-list to refer to the charter itself.

⁴² Ælfric Bata, *Anglo-Saxon Conversations: The Colloquies of Ælfric Bata*, ed. and tr. S. Gwara & D.W. Porter (Woodbridge, 1997) 54 and 134–35. I am indebted to Rosalind Love for this reference.

⁴³ *Conversations*, 113 n. 96, and compare 205.

⁴⁴ Niermeyer (ed.), *Lexicon*, 947, *s.v.* *scrinium*, for 'reliquary', and citing *Gesta sanctorum patrum Fontuellensis coenobii*, ed. and tr. F. Lohier and J Laporte (Rouen, 1936), 27 (c. 3 §2) for 'archive'. Latham (ed.), *Word-List*, 426, *s.v.* *scrinium* gives 'shrine, reliquary' but also 'papal notary' and 'archivist' for *scriniarius*. The word occurs twice in a set of Old English glosses from the eleventh century now in Antwerp, Plantin-Moretus Museum 47 and BL MS. Add. 32246: 'arca uel scrinium scrin' and once as 'scrinium uel cancellaria idem sunt hordfæt'; other parallels are 'cancellarius .i. scriniarius burþen', and 'primiscrinus yldest burþen; Et sacri scriniarius cyrcweard' (A. di P. Healey, *The Dictionary of Old English Corpus* 2009 Release, University of Toronto, available at <http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doecorpus/>, August 2003, *s.v.* *scrinium*); these glosses have been discussed in the context of the royal chancery by S. Keynes, *The Diplomas of King Æthelred 'the Unready' 978–1016: A Study in their Use as Historical Evidence* (Cambridge, 1980), 145–59.

⁴⁵ S.981, S.1478, and S.1521 are vernacular writs of the eleventh century and state that copies were to be kept *mid þise kinges halidome*; compare also S.1520 which has a similar formula in Latin (*in thesaurum Regis*). For the keeping of records in the royal *haligdom* see C.R. Hart, 'The *Codex Wintoniensis* and the King's *haligdom*', in J. Thirsk (ed), *Land, Church, and People: Essays presented to Professor H.P.R. Finberg* (Reading, 1970) 7–38: 18–19, F. Barlow, *The English Church 1000–1066: A History of the Later Anglo-Saxon Church*, 2nd edn (London, 1979), 121–24, and S. Keynes, 'Regenbald the Chancellor (*Sic*)', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 10 (1987), 185–222 at 190.

⁴⁶ T. Hearne (ed), *Hemingi chartularium ecclesie Wigorniensis*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1723), 284–85.

⁴⁷ F. Tinti, 'From Episcopal Conception to Monastic Compilation: Hemming's Cartulary in Context', *Early Medieval Europe* 11 (2002), 233–61 at 242.

⁴⁸ Hemming related Wulfstan's concern about the loss of Worcester's documents and therefore its history: see Hearne (ed), *Hemingi chartularium*, vol. 1, 282–85, and Tinti, 'Conception', 242.

⁴⁹ 'Theca, feretrum', with cross-reference to *urceus*, 'sepulcrum, feretrum, theca Reliquiarum', Du Cange (ed), *Glossarium*, vol. 8, 384, *s.v.* '3 Urna' and vol. 8, 383, *s.v.* 'Urceus'; 'sarcophagus', Niermeyer (ed), *Lexicon*, vol. 2, 1373; 'bushel 11c', Latham (ed), *Word-list*, 501.

⁵⁰ *Vita* I.4 and II.3, and Ch. 4 of the 'Miracles of St Wulfstan': R.R. Darlington (ed), *The Vita Wulfstani of William of Malmesbury* (London, 1928), 10, 26–27 and 118, and J.H.F. Peile (tr.), *William of Malmesbury's Life of St Wulfstan* (Felinfach, 1934; reprinted 1996), 13 and 40.

⁵¹ This has been suggested by Gatch, 'Piety', 161–62, and seems also to have been the objective of 'The Miracles of St Wulfstan', for which see *Vita Wulfstani*, xlv and 115–16.

⁵² *Lives*, cii.

⁵³ *William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum Anglorum: The History of the English Kings*, ed. and tr. R.A.B. Mynors, R.M. Thompson, and M. Winterbottom, vol. 2 (Oxford 1998–99), 348–51 (§196.2); *Chronicle*, vol. 2, 582–83 (*s.a.* 1057); *ASC D, s.a.* 1057; *Vita Æwardi*, 21.

⁵⁴ Hearne (ed), *Hemingi chartularium*, vol. 1, 251, 259–62, 264–65, and 278.

⁵⁵ The two Worcester-lists are in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Hatton 113 (S.C. 5210), 3r–8v; and CCC 391, pp. 3–14. Both lists have been printed by J. Gerchow (ed), *Die Gedenküberlieferung der Angelsachsen: mit einem Katalog der Libri Vitae und Necrologien* (Berlin 1988) 340–41. 'Godgiftu comitissa' is listed in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 113 (S.C. 5210), 7v.

⁵⁶ For discussions of Hemming and Leofric, see especially A. Williams, 'The Spoliation of Worcester', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 19 (1996), 383–408, at 386–88; J. Hunt, 'Piety, Prestige or Politics? The House of Leofric and the Foundation and Patronage of Coventry Priory', in G. Demidowicz (ed), *Coventry's First Cathedral: The Cathedral and Priory of St Mary. Papers from the 1993 Anniversary Symposium* (Stamford, 1994), 97–117; and Barlow, *English Church 1000–1066*, 56–57. The biographical passage was printed by Hearne (ed), *Hemingi chartularium*, vol. 2, 403 and 406.

⁵⁷ See p. \$\$\$ above for the manuscript-description, and p. \$\$\$ below for the text.

⁵⁸ The large number of writs containing the formula in question was also noted by Harmer, *Writs*, 459.

⁵⁹ ‘Her geswutelad̃ hu Wlstan bisceop becom to biscoprice’ (London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A.xiii, 177v; printed by Hearne (ed), *Hemingi chartularium*, vol. 2, 403). The other examples from Healey, *Dictionary Corpus*, are *Judith* (A4.2, 0071 [280]); a heading in the Old English translation of Genesis (B8.1.4.1 0247 [12.0]); Byrhtferth’s *Enchiridion* (B20.20.1, 0565 [2.1.325]); an Old English gloss to the Benedictine Rule (C4 0212 [6.26.1]); a short text on the consumption of blood (B6.2 1 [1]), and the ‘Vision’ itself. See also B. Withers, *The Illustrated Old English Hexateuch: The Frontier of Seeing and Reading in Anglo-Saxon England* (London, 2007), 186–95; he has noted that forms of *sweotolian* often occur in introductions to saint’s lives (p. 191 and 360 n. 20), but these do not use the formula *her swutelað* or variants thereof.

⁶⁰ See D.N. Dumville, *Liturgy and the Ecclesiastical History of Late Anglo-Saxon England: Four Studies* (Woodbridge 1992), 119–27, for a discussion and examples of such additions.

⁶¹ Note, however, that Winchcombe was in the diocese of Worcester, and that *Vita breuior* emphasises Kenelm’s martyrdom at Clent, which was near Worcester and (for a time) owned by the cathedral; see Love, *Lives*, cii.

⁶² Love (ed. & tr.), *Lives*, Love, *Lives*, ci, Gatch, ‘Piety’, and Dumville, *Liturgy*, 119, respectively. For a broader discussion of ‘liturgico-literary studies’, and the difficulties in our understanding thereof, see M.M. Gatch, ‘Old English literature Literature and the Liturgy: Problems and Potential’, *Anglo-Saxon England* 6 (1977), 237–47, who has included a reference to ‘The Vision of Leofric’ on pages 243–44.

⁶³ Gatch, ‘Miracles’; Gatch, ‘Piety’.

⁶⁴ For this connexion, and the difficult relationship between Leofric and the bishops of Worcester, see Baxter, *Earls*, 168–77.

⁶⁵ Baxter, *Earls*, *passim*; *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum: the Acta of William I (1066–1087)*, ed. D. Bates (Oxford, 1998), 193 (no. 32), and C.P. Lewis, ‘The Early Earls of Anglo-Norman England’, *Anglo-Norman Studies* 13 (1990), 207–23 at 215–16.

⁶⁶ A. Williams, *The English and the Norman Conquest* (Woodbridge, 1995), 25–26.

⁶⁷ Williams, *The English*, 51–52.

⁶⁸ ASC DE, *s.a.* 1071; *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. and tr. M. Chibnall, vol. 2 (Oxford 1968–80), 258–9. Their fate has been discussed by Williams, *The English*, 53–57.

⁶⁹ Hearne (ed), *Hemingi chartularium*, vol. 1, 262. See also Baxter, *Earls*, 168–77 for other possible explanations for Hemming’s view of Leofric and his family.

⁷⁰ N. Brooks, *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury: Christ Church from 597 to 1066* (Leicester, 1984), 292–94.

⁷¹ ASC 1052 CDE, 1050 D, and 1051 F for Sandwich; and ASC 1052 D for Leofric’s role.

⁸⁴ The phrase *þriddan gebyrtide* is otherwise unattested in Old English but seems clearly to refer to the time of rebirth into Paradise. The ‘third birth’ in this sense is attested by several authors, including Ælfric’s homily for the feast of St Paul the Apostle and an anonymous homily for Monday of Rogationtide (*Corpus* B1.1.29 and B3.2.35), both of which are strikingly apposite to this vision, although both use the word *acennednes*; see the *Dictionary of Old English*, s.v. The other most likely possibility is that it refers to Christmas, but both *byrtide* and *acennednes* in this sense are normally accompanied by a modifier (‘Christ’s’ or ‘our Lord’s’: see *Dictionary of Old English*, s.v.); the context in the ‘Vision’ is one of coming to Paradise; and the speaker has just referred to baptism which is described in the homilies as the ‘second birth’ (*Dictionary of Old English*, s.v. *acennednes* and *geedcenned*).